

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
Coos Bay District**

**Bum Creek/South Sisters Creek and Big Creek Phase II Instream Structure Placements
DNA No. 13 to Environmental Assessment (EA) OR125-98-09**

A. Describe the Proposed Action:

Bum Creek and South Sisters Creek Instream Structure Placement

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife(ODFW) habitat inventories indicate that both Bum Creek and South Sisters Creek are deficient in large wood. Both reaches are rated “Poor” for Large Woody Debris Pieces per 100 meters of stream and for Large Wood “Key” Pieces per 100 meters of stream. This missing habitat component is also reflected in the current coho habitat ratings; “Poor” for Bum Creek and a low “Fair” for South Sisters Creek. Adding large wood to these reaches will increase the quality and amount of habitat for fish and aquatic species.

The proposal is to place 50 to 65 pieces of wood into large wood complexes (jams) or as single piece additions in Bum Creek and South Sisters Creek (T. 20S., R. 08W., Section 13). Wood will be placed in such a manner as to simulate natural wood delivery and accumulation in the stream channel. Damage to the surrounding vegetation, streambanks, and ground disturbance will be minimized. Logs will be placed using a cable yarding system from existing roads, however some short access spur roads will be developed to get an excavator to the channel to place boulders. All access roads will be reclaimed at the end of the project.

Big Creek Instream Structure Placement Phase II

Phase I of this project, which will occur the summer of Fiscal Year 2002, will include approximately 1.50 miles of private stream channel (Roseburg Resources) and 1.00 miles of BLM administered stream (T. 21S., R. 08W., Sections 4, 5, 8, 17, and 18). Approximately 212 logs over 40 feet in length and greater than 20 inches in diameter (most will average >30 inches), and 304 boulders will be placed over 55 sites in the lower 2.50 miles of stream channel. Phase I of Big Creek Instream Structure Placement was covered in Big Creek Instream Structure Placement DNA 12 to EA OR125-98-09.

This phase (Phase II) of the project may include approximately 0.50 miles of private stream channel (Roseburg Resources) and 1.50 miles of BLM administered stream (T. 21S., R. 08W., Sections 5, 17, 18 and 19). Approximately 200 logs and 60 large boulders will be placed in Big Creek and two tributaries to Big Creek. Logs will be keyed into existing stream banks and riparian trees to form logjam structures consisting of up to 10 to 12 logs per site. Logs will be placed in such a manner as to simulate natural wood delivery and accumulation in the stream channel. Boulders will be placed in clusters for structural diversity. Damage to the surrounding vegetation, streambanks, and ground disturbance will be minimized. Logs will be over 40 feet in length and greater than 20 inches in diameter (most will average >30 inches). Boulders will average 1 cubic yard in size and will also be used to hold logs in place. A number of streamside red alder trees will be either cut to fall over the channel or tipped/pulled over with root wads attached to add to channel complexity. Only a few alders will be dropped at any site to minimize impact to canopy cover (currently at nearly 100%) and maintain stream water temperature. Logs will be placed using a cable yarding system from existing roads, however some short access spur roads will be developed to get an excavator to the channel to place boulders. All access roads will be reclaimed at the end of the project.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance.

Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (May, 1995)

- The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable Land Use Plans, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following Land Use Plan decisions (Objectives, terms, and conditions):

The Aquatic Conservation Strategy¹ was developed to restore and maintain the ecological health of the watershed and aquatic ecosystems contained within them on public lands. The strategy would protect salmon and steelhead habitat on federal lands managed by the Forest Service and the and the Bureau of Land Management within the range of Pacific

¹ The appropriate landscape scale for evaluating the consistency of individual and groups of projects with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy is the watershed, corresponding with “fifth-field” hydrologic unit code as defined in the “Federal Guide for Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale.”

Ocean anadromy (*Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan* Record of Decision, 1994, Standards and Guidelines, p. B-9).

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Large wood, root wad, and boulder placement is addressed in BLM EA OR125-98-09, West Fork Smith River Instream and Riparian Restoration (approved March 30, 1998).

On August 8, 2001 the Coos Bay District, BLM received a Biological Opinion (OSB2001-0070-PC-AM) from National Marine Fisheries Service authorizing certain “likely to adversely affect” actions to occur on federal lands. Included in this Biological Opinion are in-stream structure placements.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria.

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or as a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The Proposed actions are not located at sites specifically identified in the EA; however, the design features and anticipated environmental consequences of the projects are substantially the same as those for sites analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The EA analyzed the placement of in-stream structures within the stream channel of the West Fork Smith River. A broad range of affected environments and environmental consequences were analyzed. The ground-disturbing activities, impacts to water quality, project timing, and duration of work involved in these projects are essentially the same.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

The referenced EA contain a No Action and Proposed Action Alternative. The primary objective of the action was to maintain or restore natural habitat components within riparian areas. The proposed action was deemed to be the most appropriate to ensure long-term viability. No additional environmental concerns, interests, or resource values are known to be present at the current proposed action sites that would prompt the formation of additional alternatives.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

No new information or circumstances are known which would affect the validity of the existing analysis. The listing status and consultation requirements for special status fish species are complex, and subject to change within short time periods. Therefore, a Coos Bay District fish biologist will need to assess the status of consultation requirements for each project prior to awarding contracts to begin work.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The methodology and analytical approach used in the EA are appropriate to the proposed actions. The in-stream structure placements and construction of temporary access roads were analyzed and implemented utilizing an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists. The extent and duration of the impacts of the projects are expected to be substantially the same.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Based on review by an interdisciplinary team (listed below in section E), the anticipated direct, and indirect effects of the proposed action are substantially the same as identified in the EA. While the existing NEPA document does not analyze site-specific impacts of the current proposed action, the existing environmental factors, design features, and anticipated environmental consequences are expected to be the same or less.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)

All work will occur during low-flow conditions during the instream work period (as designated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife). The short-term and cumulative impacts would be substantially unchanged.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Comments received from the public, and issues/concerns developed by the interdisciplinary team were analyzed in the existing document. Other than the locations, the proposed projects are essentially the same as those analyzed in the EA.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Name

Tim Barnes

Mike Haggerty

Madeleine Vander Heyden

Aimee Hoefs

Steve Samuels

Jenny Sperling

Scott Knowles

Tim Votaw

Terri Colby

Title

Soil Scientist/Geologist/Adverse Energy

Impacts

Hydrologist

Wildlife Biologist

Fisheries Biologist

Archaeologist

Botanist

Port-Orford-cedar/Noxious

Weed/Environmental Justice Coordinator

Hazardous Materials Specialist

Natural Resource Specialist

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Conclusion Recommended by: NRSA: Kathy Wall

Date: 07/11/02

NRSA: Ralph L. Thomas

Date: 07/11/02

NRSA: Steven D. Fowler

Date: 07/15/02

Conclusion Approved by: Field Manager: /s/ *Kathy Wall, Acting*

Date: 07/15/02

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

USDI-BLM
OR120-1792-1
(July 1999)

In-stream Structure Placements: Consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS)

ACS Objectives Northwest Forest Plan	Factors/ Indicators (NMFS)	DNA. No. 7 to EA OR125-98-09
<p>2, 4, 8, 9</p> <p>Design features will maintain spatial and temporal connectivity within the drainage network with regard to shade and water temperature (ACS#2), maintain water quality with respect to temperature (ACS#4), maintain vegetation for adequate summer/winter thermal regulation for aquatic species (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitat for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Water Quality/ Temperature</p>	<p>Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams. The addition of large wood within the stream channel would likely improve pool habitat and complexity. It is not expected that the proposed actions would effect stream temperature.</p>
<p>4, 5, 6, 8, 9</p> <p>Design features will maintain water quality (ACS#4) in the long term, maintain the sediment regime in the long term (ACS#5), maintain instream flows to retain patterns of sediment routing (ACS#6), maintain vegetation to provide adequate rates of erosion (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitat for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Water Quality/ Sediment/ Turbidity</p>	<p>Any sediment and/or turbidity generated from the placement of logs within the stream channel, would likely be localized and of short duration. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed actions would affect water quality.</p>
<p>4, 6, 8, 9</p> <p>Design features will maintain water quality with regard to chemical concentration/ nutrients (ACS#4), maintain instream flows to retain patterns of nutrient routing (ACS#6), maintain vegetation to provide adequate nutrient filtering (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitat for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Water Quality/ Chemical Concentration/ Nutrients</p>	<p>Compliance with the Oregon State Forest Practice Rules regarding spill prevention and containment (OAR 629-620-100 Sections 2, 3, and 4) should reduce the possibility of release of hazardous materials to surface waters.</p>
<p>2, 9</p> <p>These design features will maintain spacial and temporal connectivity within the drainage network (ACS#2) and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Habitat Access/ Physical Barriers</p>	<p>The proposed project will not create physical barriers or otherwise degrade access to aquatic habitat, nor will it correct any existing barriers.</p>
<p>3, 5, 6, 8, 9</p> <p>Design features will maintain the banks and bottom configurations of the aquatic system (ACS#3), maintain the sediment regime in the long term (ACS#5), maintain in-stream flows to retain patterns of sediment routing (ACS#6), maintain vegetation to provide adequate rates of erosion, and to supply coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitat for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Habitat Elements/ Sediment</p>	<p>Any sediment and/or turbidity generated from the placement of structures within the stream channel, would likely be localized and of short duration. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed actions would affect water quality.</p>
<p>6, 8, 9</p> <p>These design features will maintain instream flows to retain patterns of wood routing (ACS#6), Maintain vegetation to provide an adequate supply of course woody debris sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).</p>	<p>Habitat Elements/ Large Woody Debris</p>	<p>The proposed action would include the addition of large woody debris. The addition of large wood structures into the stream channel should aid in the recovery of degraded in-stream habitats, as well as the aquatic and riparian dependent species that utilize the habitat. The placement of large wood and boulders is expected to increase beneficial substrate deposition behind the structures, thus improving fish spawning and rearing habitats. The addition of structure within the stream channel would also decrease stream flow velocities, contribute to the protection of bottom configurations and streambanks, and increase pool complexity and quality. Therefore, it is expected the actions would “restore” the large wood baseline.</p>

3, 5, 6, 8, 9 Design features will maintain stream-bottom configurations (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), stream flow (ACS#6), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitat for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).	Habitat Elements/ Pool Area (%)	The proposed action (addition of in-stream structures) would be expected to increase % pool area. The addition of structure into the stream channel should increase pool depth, quality and frequency. Therefore, it is expected the actions would “restore” pool area.
3, 5, 6, 8, 9 Design features will maintain stream-bottom configurations (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), stream flow (ACS#6), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian dependent populations (ACS#9).	Habitat Elements/ Pool Quality	The proposed action (addition of in-stream structures) would be expected to improve pool quality. The addition of large wood structure into the stream channel should increase pool depth, quality and frequency. Therefore, it is expected the actions would “restore” pool quality.
1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 Design features will maintain watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), connections with floodplains and wetlands (ACS#2), the physical integrity of the aquatic system (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), streamflow (ACS#6), the timing and variability of floodplain inundation (ACS#7), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Habitat Elements/ Off-Channel Habitat	Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams on and adjacent to, the project area. No proposed actions would diminish large wood recruitment, accelerate sediment delivery, alter the flow regime, reduce the flood-prone area or impinge on its function; thus would not effect off-channel habitats.
2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 Design features will maintain stream network connections (ACS#2), the physical integrity of the aquatic system (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), streamflow (ACS#6), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Channel Condition and Dynamics/ Width to Depth Ratio	Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams on and adjacent to, the project area. The proposed actions are not expected to adversely effect in-stream flows, sediment delivery, large wood recruitment, or streambank vegetation. Therefore, it is expected the actions would maintain width/depth ratio.
3, 5, 6, 8, 9 Design features will maintain the physical integrity of the aquatic system (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), streamflow (ACS#6), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Channel Condition and Dynamics/ Streambank Condition	Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams on and adjacent to, the project area. Impacts to streambanks within the project area would be minimal. No activities would likely alter streambank vegetation. Therefore, it is expected the actions would maintain width/depth ratio.
1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 Design features will maintain watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), connections with floodplains and wetlands (ACS#2), the physical integrity of the aquatic system (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), streamflow (ACS#6), the timing and variability of floodplain inundation (ACS#7), and amounts and distributions of large wood sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Channel Condition and Dynamics/ Floodplain Connectivity	Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams on federally managed lands within, and adjacent to, the project area. Any road construction would be temporary and to minimum standards. No proposed actions would alter the floodplain or floodplain connectivity.

1, 2 Design features will maintain the distribution, diversity and complexity of watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), and the spatial and temporal connectivity within the drainage network (ACS#2).	Watershed Condition/ Road Density and Location	Equipment would be used from existing roads or short temporary access roads. It is expected that the actions would maintain the existing road density and locations.
1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 Design features will maintain watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), connections within and between watersheds (ACS#2), the sediment regime (ACS#5), streamflow (ACS#6), the timing and variability of floodplain inundation (ACS#7), and species composition and structural diversity of riparian plant communities (ACS#8), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Watershed Condition/ Disturbance History	The proposed actions would not be expected to disturb Riparian Reserves, stream channels, or upland habitats at the watershed scale. The actions would likely restore stream habitat conditions at the site scale.
1, 3, 5, 8 Design features will maintain watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), the physical integrity of the aquatic system (ACS#3), the sediment regime (ACS#5), and species composition and structural diversity of riparian plant communities (ACS#8).	Watershed Condition/ Landslide and Erosion Rates	The proposed actions do not include any activities that would increase landslide and erosion rates. Riparian vegetation impacts would be minimal. Therefore, proposed actions would likely maintain landslide rates within the watershed.
1, 2, 4, 8, 9 Design features will maintain watershed and landscape-scale features (ACS#1), connections within and between watersheds (ACS#2), and species composition and structural diversity of riparian plant communities (ACS#8), and therefore maintain water quality (ACS#4), and therefore maintain habitats for well-distributed riparian-dependent populations (ACS#9).	Watershed Condition/ Riparian Reserves	Riparian Reserve widths would be maintained on all streams on and adjacent to, the project area. Disturbance to the Riparian Reserve would consist of yarding large wood into the stream channel. This would be expected to restore the site in the long term, and would not be expected to impact the Riparian Reserves.